

Table C-83a. Percentage distribution of Federal obligations for research and development to each performer for selected agencies, by State: fiscal year 2001

Page 1 of 2

State (in order of total Federal research & development obligations)	Total	Intra-mural ¹	Extramural						
			Industrial firms	FFRDCs admin by industrial firms	Universities and colleges	FFRDCs admin by univs and colleges	Other non-profit institutions	FFRDCs admin by nonprofit institutions	State and local govts
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
California	16.2	11.6	16.2	.0	13.4	56.5	15.5	5.2	4.9
Maryland	11.9	27.8	7.7	18.1	5.9	.0	8.9	.1	1.8
Virginia	6.2	7.9	9.5	.0	1.9	1.4	1.9	15.1	2.1
Massachusetts	5.5	1.9	5.1	.0	5.7	5.1	22.8	10.4	2.0
Georgia	4.3	1.6	9.8	.0	2.1	.0	.5	.0	1.7
New York	4.3	1.4	2.9	.0	8.3	.0	6.9	19.8	21.4
Texas	3.7	2.7	4.3	.0	5.9	.0	2.0	.0	3.3
Florida	3.4	4.4	4.7	.0	2.5	.0	.5	.0	2.9
District of Columbia	3.3	9.3	1.3	.0	1.0	.0	5.1	*	.6
Pennsylvania	3.3	.9	3.3	.0	6.4	.4	5.9	.0	1.6
New Mexico	3.3	2.5	.7	68.8	.8	20.1	.3	.0	.7
Alabama	3.0	4.5	4.1	.0	1.7	.0	.6	.0	1.2
Ohio	3.0	4.6	2.5	.0	2.8	.0	4.0	.0	1.5
Arizona	2.3	1.2	4.7	.0	1.2	.9	.4	.0	1.4
Illinois	2.2	.4	1.0	.0	3.8	10.4	1.9	.0	4.2
New Jersey	2.0	2.7	2.5	.0	1.6	1.4	.4	.0	1.5
Washington	2.0	.9	1.7	.0	2.7	.0	4.8	12.2	1.6
North Carolina	1.8	2.3	.3	.0	3.9	.0	2.2	.0	1.7
Connecticut	1.8	.5	3.3	.0	1.9	.0	.7	.0	1.8
Colorado	1.7	1.4	1.4	.0	2.1	1.8	1.3	11.0	1.1
Michigan	1.5	.6	1.4	.0	3.3	.0	.5	.0	3.2
Missouri	1.2	.2	1.5	.0	2.2	.0	.7	.0	1.4
Minnesota	1.2	.2	1.6	.0	1.5	.0	3.2	.0	2.4
Tennessee	1.1	.5	.2	.0	1.5	.2	.9	26.4	1.1
Indiana7	.3	.7	.0	1.4	.0	.3	.0	1.0
Oregon7	.4	.5	.0	1.3	.0	.8	.0	4.8
Wisconsin6	.2	.1	.0	2.0	.0	.2	.0	1.4
Maine6	*	1.3	.0	.1	.0	1.3	.0	1.1
Rhode Island6	1.3	.2	.0	.5	.0	1.0	.0	.3
New Hampshire5	.2	1.0	.0	.5	.0	.2	.0	1.2
Mississippi5	.9	.3	.0	.6	.0	.2	.0	.7
Utah5	.4	.4	.0	1.0	.0	.1	.0	.5
West Virginia5	.6	.4	.0	.3	1.0	.6	.0	.5
Iowa4	.2	.1	.0	1.2	.4	.1	.0	1.3
South Carolina4	.3	.2	3.3	.7	.0	.5	.0	1.9
Kansas4	.1	.5	.0	.6	.0	.1	.0	2.5
Nevada4	.2	.8	.0	.2	.0	.1	.0	.9
Hawaii4	.4	.3	.0	.5	.0	.8	.0	.9
Louisiana4	.4	.1	.0	.8	.0	.1	.0	1.6
Kentucky3	.1	.4	.0	.7	.0	.1	.0	3.4
Oklahoma3	.3	.3	.0	.4	.0	.4	.0	.7
Alaska3	.5	.1	.0	.4	.0	.3	.0	2.3
Idaho3	.1	.1	9.8	.2	.0	.0	.0	.6
Arkansas2	.3	.2	.0	.4	.0	.1	.0	.9
Montana2	.2	*	.0	.3	.0	.4	.0	.7
Nebraska2	.1	*	.0	.4	.0	.1	.0	.9
Vermont1	*	.1	.0	.4	.0	*	.0	.7
North Dakota1	.1	*	.0	.2	.0	*	.0	.3
Delaware1	*	*	.0	.3	.0	*	.0	.4
South Dakota1	.1	*	.0	.1	.0	*	.0	.5
Wyoming	*	*	*	.0	.1	.0	.1	.0	.3

See explanatory information, if any, and SOURCE at end of table.

Table C-83a. Percentage distribution of Federal obligations for research and development to each performer for selected agencies, by State: fiscal year 2001

Page 2 of 2

State (in order of total Federal research & development obligations)	Total	Intra-mural ¹	Extramural						
			Industrial firms	FFRDCs admin by industrial firms	Universities and colleges	FFRDCs admin by univs and colleges	Other non-profit institutions	FFRDCs admin by nonprofit institutions	State and local govts
Outlying areas	0.2	0.1	0.1	.0	0.3	0.2	0.3	.0	0.5
Puerto Rico1	.1	*	.0	.3	.2	*	.0	.5
Other areas1	*	.1	.0	*	.0	.3	.0	*
Offices abroad	*	.1	*	.0	*	.0	.0	.0	.0

¹ Includes costs associated with the administration of intramural and extramural programs by Federal personnel as well as actual intramural performance.

KEY: * = Amount less than 0.5 percent
FFRDCs = Federally funded research and development centers

NOTES: Only the following 10 agencies are required to report to this section of the survey: the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Energy, Health and Human Services, Interior, and Transportation; the Environmental Protection Agency; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and the National Science Foundation. The obligations of the 10 major Research and Development (R&D) supporting agencies included in this table represent approximately 98 percent of total Federal R&D obligations in fiscal year 2001.

Geographic distribution of Department of Defense development funding to industry reflects only the location of prime contractors, not the numerous subcontractors who perform much of the research and development.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Federal Funds for Research and Development: Fiscal Years 2001, 2002, and 2003